

PAUL S. PADDALAW, ESQ. (NV Bar #10417)
Email: psp@paulpaddalaw.com
JOSHUA Y. ANG, ESQ. (NV Bar #14026)
Email: ja@paulpaddalaw.com
PAUL PADDALAW, PLLC
4560 South Decatur Blvd., Suite 300
Las Vegas, Nevada 89103
Tele: (702) 366-1888
Fax: (702) 366-1940

Attorneys for Defendant

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

SUNDANCE MEDIA GROUP, LLC,

Plaintiff,

vs.

YUNEEC USA, INC., Does I through X and
Roe Corporations I through X inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:18-cv-0388-APG-PAL

**DEFENDANT YUNEEC USA, INC.'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
TO RESPOND TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT**

(FIRST REQUEST)

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("FRCP") 6(b)(1)(A) and the Court's Local Rule 7-2, Defendant Yuneec USA, Inc. ("Yuneec") respectfully requests a 14-day extension of time, to and until April 17, 2018, to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint. Yuneec's response is due today, April 3, 2018.¹ This is Yuneec's first request for an extension of time to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint.

. . .

¹ FRCP 12(a)(1) provides that a defendant must serve an answer within 21-days after being served with the summons and complaint.

In support of this motion, Plaintiff relies upon the memorandum of points and authorities below.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

Under FRCP 6(b)(1)(A), a party may seek to extend a deadline prior to its expiration upon a showing of “good cause.” The standard to be applied by a court under FRCP 6(b)(1) is a liberal one in order to “effectuate the general purpose of seeing that cases are tried on the merits.” Ahanchian v. Xenon Pictures, Inc., 624 F.3d 1253, 1258-59 (9th Cir. 2010). Good cause “is a non-rigorous standard that has been construed broadly across procedural and statutory contexts.” Id at 1259.

In this case, good cause exists to provide Yuneec with a short two-week extension of time to respond to Plaintiff’s Complaint. Undersigned counsel, whose law firm was only just today (April 3, 2018) retained by Yuneec, needs additional time to review the Complaint, discuss the allegations set forth in that pleading with Yuneec’s management and formulate an appropriate response. Yuneec is also represented by counsel based in California, specifically Douglas Q. Hahn, Esq. and Salil Bali, Esq. of the law firm Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth, P.C. Undersigned counsel has discussed the allegations set forth in Plaintiff’s Complaint with Messrs. Hahn and Bali and is in the process of coordinating an appropriate response with them but, as referenced above, must also ensure that Yuneec management review the response and provide their input.² The additional time requested herein will provide undersigned counsel sufficient time to accomplish the foregoing.

. . .

² The additional time is also needed to permit California counsel, who have a preexisting attorney/client relationship with Yuneec, sufficient time to prepare an application for admission to this Court.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, good cause exists to grant Defendant Yuneec a short 14-day extension of time to file a response to Plaintiff's Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Paul S. Padda

Paul S. Padda, Esq.

Counsel for Defendant Yuneec

Dated: April 3, 2018

IT IS SO ORDERED:

The Court having reviewed Defendant Yuneec USA, Inc.'s motion for a 14-day extension of time to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint, it is hereby ordered that the motion is granted. Yuneec shall file a response to Plaintiff's Complaint on or before April 17, 2018.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DATED: April 6, 2018

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court's Local Rules, the undersigned hereby certifies that on this day, April 3, 2018, a copy of the foregoing document was served upon all registered parties and their counsel through the Court's electronic filing system (CM/ECF).

/s/ Paul S. Padda

Paul S. Padda, Esq.